

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARISTEO RODRIGUEZ-RAMIREZ,

Defendant.

NO. 2:14-cr-00197-RAJ

ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED
MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE
AND PRETRIAL MOTIONS DEADLINE

THE COURT having considered the stipulated motion filed by the parties requesting a continuance of the pretrial motions filing date and trial date, hereby finds that:

(1) Counsel for Mr. Rodriguez-Ramirez was appointed on May 3, 2016;

(2) Counsel for Mr. Rodriguez-Ramirez recently received a large amount of discovery that details and documents the government's lengthy investigation, which included numerous pen registers, trap and trace devices, wiretaps and search warrants over the course of two years, as well as many hours of recorded conversations and video surveillance;

(3) Despite the diligent efforts of counsel, it is unreasonable to expect counsel for Mr. Rodriguez-Ramirez to be prepared for trial as currently scheduled;

ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED MOTION TO
CONTINUE TRIAL DATE AND MOTIONS DEADLINE - 1
(Case No. 2:14-cr-00197-RAJ)

LAW OFFICES
CALFO HARRIGAN LEYH & EAKES LLP
999 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 4400
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104
TEL (206) 623-1700 FAX (206) 623-8717

1 (4) In light of the circumstances in this case, a failure to grant a continuance
2 would deny counsel for Mr. Rodriguez-Ramirez the reasonable time necessary for effective
3 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, within the meaning of 18
4 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv), and would result in a miscarriage of justice, 18 U.S.C. §
5 3161(h)(7)(B)(i);

6 (5) The present case is sufficiently complex that it is unreasonable to expect
7 adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits
8 established by this section, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii); and

9 (6) The ends of justice will be served by ordering a continuance in this case, that
10 a continuance is necessary to ensure adequate time for effective case preparation, and that
11 these factors outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

12 Accordingly, THE COURT ORDERS that the parties' stipulated motion (Dkt. #367)
13 is GRANTED. The trial date in this case is continued to December 5, 2016.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the period of time from the date of this ORDER
15 until the new trial date of December 5, 2016, shall be excludable time pursuant to the
16 Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pretrial motions, including motions in limine,
18 shall be filed no later than October 3, 2016.

19 DATED this 7th day of June, 2016.

20 
21

22 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
23 United States District Judge
24
25